



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,481	09/20/2000	Masayuki Morita	0250-0821	7125

22204 7590 12/03/2001

NIXON PEABODY, LLP
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE
SUITE 800
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

STOCKTON, LAURA LYNNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1626

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2001

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



APPLICATION NUMBER	FILED DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
--------------------	------------	-----------------------	------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

7

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), ~~which~~ whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☒ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 3
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES--

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C.

112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the parentheses embracing the R variable definition should be deleted. Further, the phrase “characterized by the fact that” in claim 1 should be replaced with “wherein”.

In claims 4, 8, 12 and 16, an “and” should be added before “octane”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. {GB 2,308,364}.

Kim et al. disclose the processes of Example 1 on page 17, Example 3 on page 18, etc. which are embraced by the instant claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. {GB 2,308,364}, Hahn et al. {U.S. Pat. 5,453,507}, Lewis et al. {U.S. Pat. 3,849,430} and Burri {Helvetica Chimica Acta, Vol. 72 (1989)}, each taken alone or in combination with each other.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Applicants claim a process of making 2-alkyl-4-isothiazoline-3-one. Kim et al. (pages 7, 8, 17 and 18), Hahn et al. (column 3, lines 49-57 and Example 1 in column 4), Lewis et al. (columns 1 and 2 and Example 9 in column 7) and Burri (Scheme 2 on page 1417, process 15b→16b and page 1422) each teach either the same process (see 102 rejection above) or a similar process to that which is instantly claimed.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP §2141.02)

The difference between some of the processes of the prior art and the process instantly claimed is that of generic description of the reactants and/or products.

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (MPEP §2142-2413)

The indiscriminate selection of “some” among “many” is prima facie obvious, *In re Lemin*, 141 USPQ 814 (1964). The motivation to make the claimed compounds derives from the expectation that structurally similar compounds would possess similar activity (i.e., a biocide). One skilled in the art would thus be motivated to utilize the processes of the prior art to arrive at the instant claimed process with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial compounds that would be useful as biocides. Therefore, the instant claimed process would have been suggested to one skilled in the art.

The showing in the specification on pages 12 and 13 has been considered. However, the prior art used in the “comparative example” was not identified and the closest prior art was not compared {e.g. comparative example on page 13 uses ethyl acetate as the solvent}. Also see the above cited prior art and the solvents used therein. Therefore,

the showing is not persuasive for overcoming the rejection of the instant claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura L. Stockton whose telephone number is (703) 308-1875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 am to 2:30 pm. If the examiner is out of the Office, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane, can be reached on (703) 308-4537.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235, 308-0196 or 305-3290.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556, 308-4242, 305-1935 or 308-2742.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Laura L. Stockton", written in a cursive style.

Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626, Group 1620
Technology Center 1600

November 30, 2001